



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

legends of the same date), some stating that it was this woman whom Jesus cured of the bloody issue; whilst others maintain that she was no less a woman than Berenice, niece to King Herod. It is also said that after the dispersion of the Apostles, St. Veronica went in company with Mary Magdalene, Martha, and Lazarus, to Marseilles, where she wrought many miracles with her kerchief. The Emperor Tiberius (the legend proceeds) heard of these miracles, and, having fallen ill, summoned Veronica to Rome, where she cured him in an instant, and was rewarded with great honours and rich presents, though, ungratefully enough, he lived and died a pagan. The remainder of her life is said to have been spent at Rome, in company with St. Peter and St. Paul, and she bequeathed the miraculous handkerchief to Pope St. Clement. Notwithstanding all this, and though she is said to have suffered martyrdom in France, and, we believe, is acknowledged as a saint and allotted a place in the calendar, this legend has never yet, we believe, received the official approbation of the Roman Catholic Church, and may, therefore, we presume, be disbelieved without pain of mortal sin. Perhaps, however, as Pope Pius IX., has lately stated, for the first time, another miracle, as old as Christianity itself, in his recent Bull, he may also, ere long, put the seal of his approbation on the legend of St. Veronica's handkerchief also.

We have not yet done with this instructive subject, and shall probably give our readers a few additional specimens of spurious relics in an early number.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from page 7.)

In the prosecution of any favourite object, what persevering industry is employed by man in the examination of all its bearings upon the destiny of his future life; and what energy he exercises, in examining all its collateral consequences? But, alas, what little exertion is employed in examining the doctrine of man's salvation, the most important subject that could engage the mind of man. The salvation of our souls is their deliverance from the guilt of sin, and the verdict of God is, that all have sinned—“There is none righteous, no, not one.” But is there no hope for the guilty, no pardon for the condemned? Yes, there is: To the Lord our God, belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him.—Dan. ix. 9. When the guilty repent sincerely, a full and free pardon of their sins is imparted to them. God says, “I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.”—Heb. viii. 12. The moment the sinner repents, he is free from the condemnation of punishment. David says (Psalms xxxii. 1, 2), “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin. And, again, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.” A full and entire remission of all their sins is granted them, through the all-sufficient merits of Christ's atonement, and the black catalogue of their crimes, which have been written down in the book of God's remembrance, by the recording angel, shall, by one penitential tear, be blotted out for ever.

A great portion of my time and attention has been hitherto devoted to the examination of the doctrine of salvation, as it is taught in the catechisms and in the Maynooth Class-book; and I found, in those books, no proofs taken from the Scripture, from the Fathers, or from the records of the early Churches, in support of the doctrine of salvation, as it is inculcated in the Church of Rome. But I found salvation more difficult to be attained in that Church than in the reformed Catholic Church, for the following reasons:—There were twelve new articles added to the original belief by Pius IV., six commandments, and five sacraments, by the Council of Trent—making altogether 23 new articles to be believed, more than are to be found in the belief of the early Churches, and not found at present in the Church of England; and to increase the difficulty, the members of the Church of Rome must believe them to be of divine institution, without proof and contrary to evidence, or an anathema will be hurled against them from the castle of St. Angelo: and it is thus the Church of Rome puts an extinguisher upon free inquiry, contrary to the doctrine of St. Paul, “prove all things.”

As indulgences are hinged upon confession, I shall take them in order, and examine upon what authority they are founded. Pius IV. says—“I, also, affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.” The Council of Trent says (Sess. 23)—“Since the power of granting indulgences has been bestowed by Christ to his Church, and she has exercised this power from the earliest antiquity, the holy Council teaches and enjoins, that the use of indulgences is, in the highest degree, salutary to Christian people; and it condemns with anathema those who assert, that they are useless, or deny that the power of granting them is in the Church.” Here are the “ipsissima verba” of the Pope, and the decree of the Fathers of Trent, without any Scriptural authority, or definition of indulgences. But the catechism says, “that an indulgence is a release from the temporal punishment due to those sins that have been forgiven us by penance and confession, by means of the superabundant merits of Christ and his saints, which are applied to our souls, by the special favour of the Church.” From this

doctrine I can conclude, that the merits of Christ alone are not sufficient without the addition of the merits of the saints; which must be considered as nothing less than awful impiety; and that our Blessed Lord did not speak the truth, when he said to his disciples, that they could have no merit of themselves—“When ye have done all things commanded, say, we are unprofitable servants” (Luke xvii. 10); which borders very closely on blasphemy. The Church of Rome holds, that the punishment incurred by sin is both temporal and eternal. That the eternal punishment is removed by the absolution of the priest, but that the temporal punishment must be paid in this life by penance, or in the next by the flames of Purgatory.

There is well-known axiom in all schools, “qui potest majus, potest et minus eodem sub respectu.” According to this principle, the priest who can absolve from the eternal guilt, can *a fortiori* absolve from the temporal punishment. The difference between the Church of Rome and Scripture doctrine is very perceptible in this instance. An Apostle tells you that if you confess your sins to God, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from ALL unrighteousness.—John i. 9.

When God pardons a sinner, it is not by half measures, but he pardons him fully as well as freely, and eternally, by his own gracious agency, without money and without price; without sacerdotal interference, or Papal indulgences. Of this you have a striking instance in the case of the man who was sick of the palsy; and also in the instance of the weeping penitent of Bethany. My reading does not enable me to go, nor do I believe can any one, farther back than the first crusade, to establish the origin of indulgences. At that time of fanatical enthusiasm, the prison-doors of all Europe were thrown open to all prisoners, however enormous their crimes, and an indulgence was granted to all those who would join the standard of the cross, and a plenary indulgence was to be applied to the souls of all those who fell by the hand of the Saracen, or who plunged their consecrated swords into the heart of an infidel. The next place I find indulgences issued from the treasury of the Vatican, was at the commencement of the pontificate of Leo X., to finish the magnificent Church of St. Peter in Rome. For this ostensible purpose, indulgences were sold, and the traffic was carried to a shameful excess in the beginning of the sixteenth century, till this coin became so base by its too frequent currency, that it led to the Reformation, the happiest event that could happen to promote the civil, political, and religious liberty of Europe. The jubilee or plenary indulgence is of pagan origin, and was introduced into the Church of Rome by Martin V., in order to fill his exhausted treasury, and to facilitate his entry into Rome, after the great schism of the west. The word jubilee signifies a time of rejoicing. In the Old Testament it occurred every fiftieth year after the completion of the seven Sabbatical years, during each of which all labour ceased for man and beast; and even the land itself was allowed a seasonable repose. But we do not find the word jubilee in the New Scripture. It is a well-authenticated historical fact, that the Popes, after being forced to leave the Eternal City in consequence of their tyranny and political oppressions, resided at Avignon in France, during the period of 75 years; and that Otho Colonna was the first Pope who was induced to return to the City of the Hills, by Petrarch, to dry up the tears of the disconsolate widow who was mourning, in sackcloth and ashes, the absence of the spiritual father of the people. The deserted city, during her melancholy widowhood, has been pathetically, yet beautifully described by the elegant muse of Petrarch, at the revival of literature, in the commencement of the 15th century. Otho Colonna was the son of a Roman citizen of great ancestral claims upon the gratitude of the Roman people; when a period of great scarcity occurred, and the people were dying by hundreds of hunger, this benevolent Roman threw open his purse and his granaries, and saved the remnant of an expiring people. In gratitude, the people raised a column to his memory; and, in subsequent times, the family name was changed to Colonna. After the deposition of the Popes of Avignon, Martin V. was elected, and took every precaution to insure himself a favourable reception in his native city. Amongst the ancient customs of the Romans was, that of celebrating secular games on the first day of January of every century, in honour of the age of the Eternal City. The new Pope was well acquainted with the Carmen Seculare, which he read in his more youthful days, in the Odes of Horace, and was sung by a choir of youths dressed in the most gorgeous attire, amidst the shouts of an admiring people, who rolled along in one unbroken wave, from the steps of the Pantheon to the majestic dome of the Capitol. After which a donative was given to the people. Pope Martin deferred his entry into the city of Rome, until the first day of January, after his elevation to that See, and had, in the meantime, hymns of jubilee composed, to be sung on the occasion, by youths beautifully dressed, in imitation of the custom of heathen Rome. On the first of January he made his public entry into the city of the Caesars, surrounded with all that was not only respectable, but magnificent, and preceded by a multitude of people who joined the youths in singing jubilate to Martin V., the representative of Colonna, the saviour of the Roman people. After the procession—a civic ovation—the Roman people were ordered to make an offering at the shrine of the

apostles, and a plenary indulgence was pronounced by Martin V. from the balcony of the Vatican. By means of this happy device, the Papal treasury was once more filled to overflowing, and the Pope was in a position to give a donation to the inhabitants of the city in imitation of the Roman emperors. Thus, the citizens of Rome, and all those who thronged into the city, were enabled to return to their respective homes, with erect heads and light hearts, after being relieved from an oppressive weight of sin by this timely yet imaginary indulgence.

The sale of indulgences, under the pontificate of Leo X., by Tetzel, a low, unprincipled man, who was selected by the Archbishop of Magdeburg, together with the great immorality of the clergy of the 16th century, were the proximate causes that led to the Reformation. From that period the human mind was emancipated from all the superstitions ignorance of the barbarous ages, and recovered its natural elasticity, while it shook off that oppressive weight which debased its powers and cramped its energies.

As it is with the *doctrine* of the Church of Rome I have to do, the immorality of the clergy before and at the time of the Reformation is foreign to my purpose, and I shall abstain from any inquiry into that disagreeable subject, and leave that task to others who may feel it their duty to expose it.

In proportion as we ascend to the days of the apostles the nearer we approach the noble simplicity of the Christian religion, like the radii of a circle that converge to its centre. The great advantage to be derived from falling back upon primary principles, is to be learned from Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, in which he says, that as soon as he found out first principles, the laws by which nations are governed became very easy to him. Let us go back in imitation of that great man to the primary principles that are to be found in the Holy Scriptures, and we cannot fail in detecting the errors that have by degrees crept into the Church since the period of the apostolic age.

The next question I had to examine in the category was, “Is the Latin language which is used in the Roman Liturgy in accordance with Gospel principles?” I answer, certainly not; as we read in the Acts ii. 4, “And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance. And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, ‘Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans. And how hear we, *every man in his own tongue*, wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God?’” The apostles received on this occasion from the Holy Spirit the power of speaking different languages, in order that *their preaching might be understood in every part of the world*—In Mesopotamia and Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia. Yet the Church of Rome continues to have her prayers read in a dead language, which is not understood by the people. St. Paul devotes an entire chapter—the fourteenth of the first Corinthians—to this subject, to show the necessity of speaking in a language which the people can understand—“If I pray in an unknown tongue my understanding is unfruitful.” The clergymen of the reformed Churches pray with their faces to their respective flocks, and, at the same time, in their vernacular language; whereas the priests pray with their backs to the people, and in a language which they do not understand—no, not even the clerk who makes the responses. In this instance the Church of Rome acts in direct opposition to her own decree, as the fourth Council of Lateran established it as a rule that the service should be in the vulgar tongue of every nation; and we find it so in every nation independent of Rome.

(To be continued.)

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXVII.

Pat and Jem did not get together for a good while to have a talk; but at last they fell in on the road, and were walking together; but Pat did little at the talking, but kept looking mighty hard at his old coat, first at one sleeve and then at the other, and then on the big patches on the breast of it.

And, indeed, poor Pat's coat was very bad. It was once made all of blue frieze, and then it must have looked very smart; but, when times got hard, Pat had to get a piece on the coat betimes, because he never had the price of a new one; so there were black patches, and gray patches, and patches the colour of mud; and there were the legs of two old stockings, sewed over the arms, from the wrists to the elbows, to keep the patches together; and all the patches looked as if the best wife in the country could not keep them together much longer.

So Pat kept looking mighty hard at his coat, and talking little.

“What's the matter with the coat at all?” said Jem.

“Well, I'm studying the old coat,” said Pat.

“Is it how to get a new one, you mean?” said Jem.

“Time enough to study that when the meal gets cheaper,” said Pat; “its this old coat I'm studying.”

“Well, and what do you make out of the old one?” said Jem.

“Well, I had a discussion on it last night,” said Pat, “and I didn't think there was as much to be got out of an old coat.”

“And what's to be got out of it?” said Jem; “tell us that, Pat.”

"Well," said Pat, "I was in last night at old Ned Flanagan's, and there was a deal of people in it, and there was Tim Reilly, the priest's schoolmaster; and they were all talking about the old religion and the new religion; and Tim Reilly was holding out that the Church of Rome had the old religion; and others was asking wasn't there things changed in it, and then how could it be the old religion? and at first Tim Reilly wouldn't give in that that there was anything changed; but there was old Ned Flanagan, that gets a newspaper, called the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and he had a deal of learning out of it; and, indeed, he promised me the reading when he had done it. So, says he to Tim, 'Is the Immaculate Conception an article of the Catholic faith?' says he. 'It is,' said Tim; 'didn't you hear the priest read the Pope's decree in the chapel?' 'And how could St. Bernard be a saint when he denied it?' said Ned. 'It wasn't an article of the faith then,' said Tim, 'for the Pope hadn't settled it.' 'Well,' says I, 'sure that's a new piece put on it anyway; and how can it be the old religion after that?'

"Well, with that he turns round to me, for he's a mighty cute little fellow that would bother anybody, and says he, 'how long have you the old coat?' says he. 'It's turning the talk, you are,' says I. 'It's not,' says he; 'it's coming to it I am: how long have you the old coat?' says he again. Well, they all allowed me to answer him: so, says I, 'it's eight years any way, and may be a bit more.' 'And mighty well mended it is,' says he, 'for the time. Now, do you mean to tell me,' says he, 'that you bought that coat eight years ago?' says he. 'Deed and I do,' says I. 'That very coat?' says he. 'This very coat,' says I. 'So he puts his hand on my shoulder, and says he, 'was this patch on when you got it?' says he. 'No,' says I. 'Nor none of the patches?' says he. 'Not one of them,' says I. 'And it's the same coat for all that,' says he.

"Well, I seen then what he was at; and when I came to think of it, it wasn't easy to think it was the same coat, when there was hardly a bit of the first coat left in it. 'Well, I think it's hardly the same, after all,' says I. 'Well, boys,' says he, 'did you ever hear the like of that? didn't he say this minute it was the very coat?'

"Well, they were all down on me then; and I tried to make the best hand I could of it; 'for sure,' says I, 'it isn't like it, for it was a blue coat when I got it, and I leave it to yourselves, boys, if you can find one bit of the blue cloth in it now.' Well, with that, the boys all began discussing if it was the same coat or not; and some allowed that as long as I took it off at night, and put it on in the morning, it was surely the same coat; and more of them allowed it was the cloth made the coat; and when the same cloth wasn't in it, how could it be the same coat. Well, when they were all done talking, says Tim to me—'Is it the same coat,' says he, 'or is it not?' 'Well, I think it's not,' says I. 'And when did it turn into another coat?' says he; 'was it when the first patch was put on it?' says he. 'No,' says I, 'it wasn't, sure enough.' 'And was it the second patch, or the third patch, or the fourth patch, or what patch?' says he, 'that turned it into another coat?' says he. Well, with that they all began again, and now they were all for allowing that it was the same coat. Well, Ned Flanagan's byre is down, and so he had the cow in the corner. So I turns to Ned, and says I, 'that's a pretty little calf,' says I. 'It's no calf,' says Ned, 'it's a cow giving milk, with a calf of her own.' 'Don't be joking,' says I, 'it's a calf.' 'It's joking you are,' says he. 'Was it ever a calf?' says I. 'It was,' says he. 'What day did it turn into a cow?' says I; 'was it a Sunday or a week-day? Here's a learned man,' says I, pointing to Tim, 'that will prove to you, that it's a calf still, if you can't tell the day it changed.' Well, with that they all allowed the day couldn't be told, and still the calf had turned into a cow.

"And, says I, 'isn't it the same with the corn that grows—who can tell the day the ear is formed? and isn't it the way with spring and summer? and with child and man? and isn't it the way with day and night? and where's the good,' says I, 'of the priest telling us our religion must be the same now that it was at first, just because no one can tell what day it changed from one religion to another; and wouldn't just the same argument prove,' says I, 'that night was day, or day night? But who would be the fool to believe it against his own eyesight,' says I, 'and where's the good of argument that's as fit to prove that black is white, as to prove anything else?' says I.

"Well, with that they all fell to talking, and they allowed that things does change, in a way that no one can tell when they changed, and that there is no use denying it.

"Well, I was considering with myself that when a thing is said sharp and clever about one thing being like another, people, maybe, is apt to take it up mighty quick, and think it very learned, without stopping to consider how far one thing is like another; so, thinks I to myself, would the religion of Jesus Christ be like an old coat at all?

"So I turns to Tim Reilly, and, says I, 'after all there's a differ between the coat getting old, and the calf turning into the cow, and I give in to you entirely that it's the very same coat I bought eight years ago.'

"To be sure there's a differ,' says he, 'between a thing getting old, and one thing turning into another, and that's what I was going to say when you would be done talking,' says he; so, then, he went on to talk a deal about the old

coat being the same, with all its patches; and just the same way, he allowed, when the Pope made new decrees and new articles of faith, his religion was still the same religion, and the old religion, for all that.

"So I waited till he was done; and then says I, 'And do you mean to tell me,' says I, 'that the religion of Jesus Christ is made up of patches and mendings, like an old coat? You're right so far, any way,' says I, 'that your religion is old enough, like the old coat,' says I; 'it's as old as being patched and mended, and threadbare and darned, and in rags and holes, and tossed and turned, can make it; but you'll never get the holes out of an old coat by turning it,' says I; 'and isn't it enough for me to have my old coat made of rags and patches without having my religion made of them too,' says I; 'and isn't that the way with all them that tries to patch up a religion of their own merits instead of the merits of Christ? for doesn't the Bible say that "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags?"* And why do I get patches on the old coat?' says I. 'Isn't it because it is wearing out and going to the bad?' And can that be the way with the religion that God made? Doesn't the Bible say that the heavens and earth will wear out like an old coat, but that God keeps still the self-same ever more?† And won't his religion keep the same? "for the Word of the Lord endureth for ever;"‡ so I leave you the old coat for your religion,' says I; 'but it won't fit the religion of Christ; for there never was a coat,' says I, 'but the one, that could be fitting for the religion of Christ.'

"Well, with that they all began tearing at me to tell what coat that was; and I made them guess for it, and of all the guesses ever you heard they were the quarest; one allowed it was what the priest says mass in; another said it was what the nuns wear on their heads; another said it was the red strip that some of the priests wear over their shoulder; one old woman said it be to be the scapular; another said it was the blue cloak that's on the picture of the Virgin Mary in the chapel; and another allowed that it be to be something that was on the Pope: but they could make no hand of it, till old Ned Flanagan, that reads his Bible, says, 'Why, then, wasn't it the coat of Christ himself, that was "without seam, woven from the top throughout?"§ That's the hit,' says I; 'would there be seams and patches in the religion of Christ, any more than on his coat?' So with that, for it was getting late, says I to Tim Reilly, 'I'll just take myself off with my old coat,' says I; 'and may you get the religion without seams or patches, afore I get a new coat.' So they all bid me the good night kindly, and maybe they will think of the coat."

"Well Pat," said Jem, "you done it well: and deed I didn't know there was much good to be got in an old coat, and when times mend, and you get a new one, I hope it will serve you as well."

We hope so, too, and we hope the state of poor Pat's coat will remind some rich people how much the poor want some warm clothing in this cold weather, when the most a poor man's wages can do, is to get a little meal at a dear price, and maybe little enough of that. May God stir up the hearts of us all to remember how "the religion without seam," teaches us to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their communications. Letters from Mr. E. Power and others are in type, and omitted from want of room.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

THE Publishers respectfully request their Subscribers to remember, that their subscriptions are payable in *advance*. When the friends of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN are informed, that at this moment above 1,000 sums of 3s. 6d. each are due to the publisher, it is hoped that those in arrear will be good enough to remit or pay the amount due, without the necessity of special applications. Where the annual sum is so small, it is impossible to make applications in the usual manner, without incurring a serious expense in proportion to the sum due. Mr. Curry will, therefore, feel greatly obliged by remittances.

* Isaiah Ixv, 6, and compare Romans x. 3.

† Thou in the beginning, O Lord, didst found the earth: and the works of thy hands are the heavens.

They shall perish, but Thou shall continue: and they shall all grow as a garment.

And as a vesture shalt Thou change them: and they shall be changed: but Thou art the self-same, and Thy years shall not fail.—Hebrews i. 10, 11, 12, and Psalm ci. 26, 27, 28, Douay Bible; Psalm cii. 25, 26, 27 in the Protestant Bible.

‡ 1 Petri i. 25, Douay Bible.

§ Gospel of St. John, xix. 23.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, FEBRUARY, 1855.

We have now before us the Letter Apostolic of the Pope on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This decree was pronounced on the 8th of December, and is published in the *Univers* of the 20th January, and in the *Tablet* of January 27. The decree is, of course, in Latin; but the *Tablet* also gives a translation, which we shall make use of in preference to any of our own.

Such a document, of course, demands our consideration, and we desire to call the attention of our readers to it.

The first sentence that requires our notice is one near the end of the first clause or paragraph of the decree, in which our Lord is spoken of as "by nature one and the same common son of God the Father, and of the Virgin."*

This savours very strongly of the ancient Eutychian heresy, which admitted only *one nature* in Christ. We hold, with the Catholic Church of all ages, that He who was born of Mary was truly God. We hold, also, that He was truly man. We hold with the Catholic creed of St. Athanasius, that he was "God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world." We hold that these two natures remained distinct and unmixed in Him. "Perfect God, and perfect man." That He was "equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood." And yet that he was "one Christ," "not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." All this our readers may see in the Athanasian Creed.

As respects his divine nature, he is the Son of God. As respects his human nature, he is the Son of Mary. And, by the unity of His person, he is the common son of both. To say that He is the common son of both by nature, whereas he is, in fact, the son of each in respect of *separate* natures, is the heresy of the Eutychians.

How the Pope fell into this error is plain enough. His object is to magnify Mary. If Mary was the mother of Jesus only by reason of his human nature, the Pope's object fails. But if Jesus was the common Son of God and of Mary, in respect of the *same nature*, then is she raised to the throne of God.

We ask our readers to consider how the new doctrine has led the Pope himself to confound the two natures of Christ, which the Catholic Church has always kept so distinct in her creed.

The Pope goes on to affirm, with the confidence that becomes a Pope, that the Church "HAS NEVER CEASED to lay down, to cherish, and to illustrate continually, by numerous proofs," the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

But, unfortunately for his assertion, the Pope tries to support it by proofs; and here is the earliest proof which he is able to produce—"For this doctrine the Church herself has most clearly pointed out, when she did not hesitate to propose the Conception of the same Virgin for the public devotion and veneration of the faithful. By which illustrious act she pointed out the Conception of the Virgin as singular, wonderful, and very far removed from the origins of the rest of mankind; and to be venerated as entirely holy, since the Church celebrates festival days only of the saints." So the earliest act of his Church, which the Pope can point to

* "Ut naturaliter esset unus idemque communis Dei Patris, et Virginis filius."

+ The followers of Eutyches denied that the two natures of God and man remained distinct and separate in Christ. The Fourth General Council of Chalcedon was called to condemn this error, and pronounced that both natures remained in Christ, each perfect and distinct from the other.